

Appl. No. 10/629,999
Amdt. Dated September 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2005

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office action mailed July 27, 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 11, and 22 being the independent claims. No claims have been amended, canceled, or withdrawn, and no new matter is believed to have been added.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 12, 15, and 21 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Nos. 6,791, 230 (Tornquist et al.) and 5,554,900 (Pop, Sr.).

In response, Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to Obviate a Double Patenting Rejection Over a Prior Patent (Terminal Disclaimer), hereby obviating the double patenting rejection. However, in doing so, Applicants wish to point out that this is not an admission that the double patenting rejection is appropriate. Nor is this a concession that the analysis employed in making the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is correct. Indeed, Applicants still believe, as was clearly delineated in their previous response, that there is simply no suggestion or motivation to modify the configuration of either (or both) of the coil support assemblies recited in independent Claim 1 of Tornquist et al. such that either (or both) would be coupled to an interlamination disk of the type disclosed in Pop, Sr. Moreover, if one were to make such a modification, it would render the invention claimed in independent Claim 1 of Tornquist et al. inoperable for its intended use. Specifically, if the inner wedge were coupled to the interlamination disk, it could not be adjustably spaced apart from the core of the rotor, as is recited in independent Claim 1.

Nonetheless, the Terminal Disclaimer submitted herewith obviates the above-noted rejection. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/629,999
Amdt. Dated September 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2005

Conclusion

Based on the above, Claims 1-22 are now clearly allowable over the applied citations. The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 9/26/05

By: 

Paul D. Amrozowicz
Reg. No. 45,264
(480) 385-5060